

**Administrative Determination**  
**Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)**  
U.S. Department of the Interior - Bureau of Land Management  
Anchorage Field Office

---

**A. Describe the Proposed Action**

The Proposed Action is to continue use of a herring monitoring station used for approximately three weeks each spring to monitor commercial herring fishery in Norton Sound and collect herring fishery data. The site is one acre in size and includes one 10' x 16' tent frame and an outhouse. The location is Kateel River Meridian, T. 25 S., R. 14 W., Section 31 on the Klikitarik River. The site is used by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

**B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance**

LUP Name <u>Southwest MFP</u>	Date Approved <u>November 1981</u>
Other document _____	Date Approved _____
Other document _____	Date Approved _____

\* List applicable LUPs (e.g., Resource Management Plans and activity, project, management, or program plans, or applicable amendments thereto)

The Proposed Action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

Objective FH-1 provides for maintaining aquatic habitat which supports population of fish in the area and allows for inventory of habitat and population.

The Proposed Action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions):

---

---

**C. Identify applicable NEPA documents and other related documents that cover the Proposed Action.**

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the Proposed Action. Environmental Assessment No. AK-040-94-010 dated February 11, 1994. This EA was in error by not identifying the Southwest MFP as an existing planning document covering the subject area.

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report).

Cultural Resources Clearance dated 3/26/97 and Subsistence and Threatened and Endangered Species Clearances dated 3/26/97 and reviewed 1/7/2000

**D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria**

- 1. Is the current Proposed Action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed? Is the current Proposed Action located at a site specifically analyzed in an existing document?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The Proposed Action is exactly the same action previously analyzed in Environmental Assessment AK-040-94-010. An existing permit is being renewed for the same site with no changes in improvements, use or location.

- 2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current Proposed Action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

No changes have occurred.

- 3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

No new circumstances exist on the ground, however environmental analysis procedures have changed to include addressing two new critical elements since the subject environmental assessment was prepared. These elements are environmental justice and invasive, non-Native species and are either not present or would not be affected by the proposed action.

- 4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current Proposed Action?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes. No changes have occurred.

- 5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current Proposed Action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA**

**document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document analyze site-specific impacts related to the current Proposed Action?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Direct and indirect impacts remain unchanged from previous site-specific analysis.

- 6. Are the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current Proposed Action substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Cumulative impacts remain unchanged.

- 7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current Proposed Action?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes.

- E. Interdisciplinary Analysis:** Identify those team members conducting or participating in the NEPA analysis and preparation of this worksheet.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>
<u>Donna Redding</u>	<u>Archaeologist</u>
<u>Bruce Seppi</u>	<u>Wildlife/Endangered Species</u>
<u>Debbie Blank</u>	<u>Botany/Endangered Species</u>
<u>Jeff Denton</u>	<u>Subsistence</u>
<u>Dave Kelley</u>	<u>Surface Reclamation</u>
<u>Mike Alcorn</u>	<u>Hazardous Materials</u>
<u>Mike Scott</u>	<u>Fisheries</u>

- F. Conclusion**

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the Proposed Action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

(Signed Nick Douglas)  
Anchorage Field Manager

(01-28-00)  
Date